[Mr. K. G. Kesavan Nair]

(*e*) the number of applications for licenses received from people in the Changanacherry taluk in 1120;

(*f*) the number of such applications granted;

(*g*) the number of applications left undisposed;

(*h*) the number of applications rejected; and

(*i*) the reasons for such dismissal?

**MR. C. P. GOPALA PANICKER**: (*a*) 2843;

(*b*) 2473;

(*c*) Yes—whole-sale, Retail and Hawker.

(*d*) The classification is made according to the nature of business done by the merchants.

(*e*) 71;

(*f*) 56;

(*g*) 15;

(*h*) Nil;

(*i*) Does not arise, in view of answer to (*h*).

*National Highways.*

24 **MR. K. G. KESAVAN NAIR**: Will the Government be pleased to state:

(*a*) whether the national highways contemplated and proposed by the Post War Committee of the Indian Government pass through Travancore; and

(*b*) which Government is to meet the expenses of the construction and development and maintenance of such national highways, whether the Government of Travancore or the Government of India?

**DEWAN BAHADUR L. VENKITAKRISHNAN**: (*a*) It may pass through Travancore.

(*b*) The matter is under discussion and correspondence.

*Collection of the arrears of Jenmikaram.*

25 **MR. M. K. CHANDRASEKHARA BHATTATHIRI**: Will the Government be pleased to state:

(*a*) the amount of jenmikaram for the year 1119 which the Government had to collect:

(*b*) the amount of jenmikaram to be collected as arrears due in the years prior to 1119;

(c) the amount collected under each of the above heads in 1119; and

(*d*) the amount disbursed in the year 1119?

**MR. G. NARAYANAN TAMPI**:

| | Rs. | Ch. | C. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| (*a*) | 10,44,382 | 15 | 6 | |
| (*b*) | 1,91,674 | 13 | 4 | |
| (c) | 7,50,427 | 12 | 6 | under current revenue and |
| | 1,04,993 | 3 | 13 | under arrears |
| (*d*) | 7,36,274 | 25 | 7 | |

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

**MR. P. K. KURIAKKOSE:** Sir, I want one matter to be cleared. What about the fate of the admitted questions which have not been answered?

**PRESIDENT:** They will all come up again later on.

ELECTION TO THE MEDICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

**PRESIDENT:** The following is the result of the election to the Medical Advisory Committee:—

| | |
|---|---|
| Mr. Joseph ... ... | 39 votes |
| Mr. Madhavan ... ... | 26 ,, |
| Mr. Moraes ... ... | 25 ,, |

Messrs. Joseph and Madhavan are declared elected.

**Non Official Business.**

## LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS.

## THE TRAVANCORE DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY BILL.

**MR. C. S. LEKSHMANA IYER** (*Trivandrum City*): Sir, I move that the Travancore Disposition of Property Bill be read in the Assembly.

**MR. M. R. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI** (*Chirayinkil cum Nedumangad*): I second it.

**MR. C. S. LEKSHMANA IYER:** This bill was introduced during the last Assembly Session and it was then referred to a Select Committee. In the Statement of Objects and Reasons it is stated thus:—

> "The object of this Bill is to give effect to the intentions of an acquirer of property to provide for those persons for whom human nature and traditional instincts impel him to do so. The law at present insists that only persons who are in existence on the date of the settlement, or, on the date on which the will takes effect, if the disposition is by will, can be the recipients of the benefit thereunder. This is an unnecessary restraint on the freedom of disposition of property and often comes into conflict with the natural wishes of people. In the experience of all, and particularly, of lawyers and Judges, numerous cases have arisen where provisions for after-born persons have been made by the settlers of property. The law in British India has validated such dispositions by Sections 13 to 15 of the Transfer of Property Act and by the Hindu Disposition of property Act of 1916. The Hindu Transfers and Bequests Act of 1914 of Madras is another instance of such legislation. A Legislation on the lines of this Bill for Travancore has been too long delayed."

**MR. M. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI:** May I ask the honourable member what the expression "whenever made" in Clause 2 is intended to mean.

**MR. C. S. LEKSHMANA IYER:** It is intended that this Act must have retrospective effect in regard to Disposition of Property which are to be given effect to only later. That is what I intended. As it is a change from the law in British India it may be a matter that has to go into a Select Committee.

**MR. A. P. UDAYABHANU:** I oppose this Bill because this is a piecemeal legislation. My point is that it should be introduced as a whole.

**MR. K A. MOHAMMED:** I oppose the bill in its present form. This Bill, if, as it stands at present is to become Law it would affect all people who are domiciled in Travancore irrespective of their

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly